



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,471	04/06/2005	Kouji Muramoto	P27669	5344

7055 7590 02/08/2008  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER
----------

DUONG, THANH P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1797

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/08/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com  
pto@gbpatent.com

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/530,471

Applicant(s)

MURAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Tom P. Duong

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/23/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's remarks and amendments filed on November 23, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication Number 2000-161647 ("JPN '647").

Regarding claim 1, JPN '647 discloses an exhaust gas processing device (Fig. 8) comprising: an air preheater (3) for preheating air for combustion in a combustion device (1) by using an exhaust gas emitted from the combustion device (1); a gas-gas heater heat recovery device (4) comprising a heat transfer tube (Fig. 1) for recovering the heat of the exhaust gas at the outlet of the air preheater to a heat medium (section 0003); a dust collector (5) for collecting dust (Section 0003) in the exhaust gas at the outlet of the gas-gas heater heat recovery device (4); a wet-type desulfurization device (7) for removing sulfur oxide (Section 0003) in the exhaust gas at the outlet of the dust collector (5); a gas-gas heater re-heater (8) comprising a heat transfer tube (Section

0008) for heating the exhaust gas at the outlet of the wet-type desulfurization device (7) by using the heat medium supplied from said gas-gas heater heat recovery device (4), being arranged in that order from the upstream side to the downstream side of an exhaust gas duct of the combustion device (1); and a heat medium circulation line (Fig. 8, circulation line between GGH heat recovery machine 4 and GGH reheater 8) for connecting heat transfer tubes provided in each of the gas-gas heater heat recovery device and the gas-gas heater re-heater and for circulating the heat medium through the heat transfer tubes (Section 0011), wherein the heat transfer tube of the gas-gas heater heat recovery device (4) is squarely arranged in the gas flow direction (Figs. 1, 3, 4-7, 16-17) in such a manner that the inter-tube flow rate, which is the flow rate of the exhaust gas between the heat transfer tubes adjacent in the direction orthogonal to the gas flow direction less than 10 m/s or lower. Note, the recitation of "the flow rate of the exhaust gas between the heat transfer tubes adjacent in the direction orthogonal to the gas flow direction less than 10 m/s or lower" is directed to the manner of operating the device. The examiner notes that neither the manner of operating a disclosed device nor material or article worked upon further limit an apparatus claim. Said limitations do not differentiate apparatus claims from prior art. See MPEP 2114 and 2115. Further, the examiner notes that process limitations do not have patentable weight in an apparatus claim. See *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969) that states (Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof and to an intended operation are no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim."

Regarding claim 4, JPN '647 at least three stages (12-1, 12-2, 12-3) of the heat transfer tubes comprising a bare tube (12-1) are installed on the stage preceding the fin-equipped heat transfer tubes of the gas-gas heater re-heater (Figs. 3-6), and said bare tube is staggered arrangement in the gas flow direction so that the inter-tube flow rate, which is the flow rate of the exhaust gas between the heat transfer tubes adjacent in the direction orthogonal to the gas flow direction, cannot be more than 12 to 16 m/s (Sections 0026-0027).

Regarding claim 5, JPN '647 discloses the heat transfer tubes composed of the bare tube (12-1) installed in the stage preceding the fin-equipped heat transfer tubes of the gas-gas heater re-heater are either made a part of the heat medium circulation line (Fig. 8, circulation line between GGH heat recovery machine (4) and GGH reheater (8) for circulating the heat medium through the gas-gas heater heat recovery device (4) and the gas-gas heater re-heater (8), or made a steam line for flowing steam that is installed separately from said heat medium circulation line (Figs. 14-15).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JPN '647 in view of Iwashita et al. (6,096,279). JPN '647 discloses a dust collector but does not disclose a specific dust collector of a wet type disposed between the wet-type desulfurization device and the gas-gas heater re-heater in the exhaust gas duct. Iwashita et al. teaches that it is desirable provide a wet type dust collector downstream of absorption tower 13 or wet-type desulfurization device and upstream of the reheating section 5 GGH in order to achieve a high degree of purification of the flue gas (Col. 3, lines 31-38). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Iwashita et al. to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a wet type dust collector as taught by Iwashita et al. in the device of JPN '647 in order to achieve a high degree of purification of the flue gas.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JPN '647 in view of Japanese Publication Number 09-280540 ("JPN '540"). JPN '647 discloses a gas-gas heater and gas-gas heater re-heater with fin-equipped heat transfer tubes but is silent with respect to the fin pitch. JPN '540 teaches that it is desirable to provide a heat exchanger (Abstract) with fin pitch set within 8-10 mm. Such configuration provides minimum pressure loss in the system and minimizes dust blockage in the system (Section 0009). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of JPN '540 to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the fin pitch ranges as taught by JPN '540 in the heat transfer tubes of GGH recovery device and GGH heater re-heater of JPN '647 in order to optimize pressure loss and minimize dust blockage in the system.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JPN '647 in view of Japanese Publication Number 2000-304238 ("JPN '238"). JPN '647 essentially discloses the features of the claimed invention except a dust removers disposed in front and back of the tube bundles. JPN '238 teaches that a soot blower 18 (Fig. 1) with lance 16 or dust remover is provided between the heat transfer tubes to facilitate in removing soot which adheres to the heat transfer tubes. Thus, it would have been obvious in view of JPN '238 to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of JPN '647 with dust removers as taught by '238 in order to remove dust from the heat transfer tubes, which prevent reduction of heat transfer efficiency (Abstract). With respect to the configuration of the number of stages of the heat transfer tubes with a width of 3000 mm or less, JPN '647 discloses plurality of stages, three stages (12-1, 12-2, 12-30 and) and it appears that JPN '647 discloses the width of the three stages are less than 3000 mm or less being the fact the number of stages (three stages) in JPN '647 is much less than the required claimed eight stages. Furthermore, Applicants disclose a preferred embodiment of heat transfer tubes of no more than eight stages with a width of 3000 mm or less (specification page 11, last paragraph) and it appears that JPN '647 discloses the heat transfer tubes with three stages (12-1, 12-2, 12-3) much less than the required eight stages of the claimed invention and therefore, it appears that the width of the heat transfer tubes of three stages of JPN '647 falls within the broad ranges of 3000 mm or less of the claimed invention.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JPN '647 in view of Japanese Publication Number 2000-320998 ("JPN '998"). JPN '647 discloses a GGH recovery device and GGH heater re-heater but fails to disclose dust removers and differential pressure gauges and/or thermometers in front and back of the bundles and control devices to activate the dust removers when the measured differential pressure and measured temperature is set higher or lower than the set point. JPN '998 teaches that a controller 100 (Fig. 1) controls the operation of the soot blower (9) based on the measured pressure drop (via pressure gauges 21-24) and measured temperature (via thermometers 25-28) in the heat recovery unit (7) and reheater (8). The control device (100) of JPN '998 provides the advantage of efficient dust removal and thereby, improves heat transfer for the heat transfer tubes (Sections 0015-0018). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of JPN '998 to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a control device with pressure gauges and thermometers as taught by JPN '998 in the device of JPN '647 in order to provide a control means for controlling the operation of the dust removers and thereby, improves heat transfer.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 23, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argued that "none of these documents disclose or suggest to motivate one of ordinary skill in the pertaining art to arrange the heat transfer tubes such that "the inter-tube flow rate, which is the flow rate of the exhaust gas between the heat transfer tubes adjacent in the direction orthogonal to the gas flow



direction, can be less than 10 m/s" as recited in present claim 1." It is submitted that JPN '647 discloses all structural features of the claimed invention and the recitation of "the inter-tube flow rate, which is the flow rate of the exhaust gas between the heat transfer tubes adjacent in the direction orthogonal to the gas flow direction, can be less than 10 m/s" as recited in present claim 1" is directed to the manner of operating a device. The examiner notes that neither the manner of operating a disclosed device nor material or article worked upon further limit an apparatus claim. Said limitations do not differentiate apparatus claims from prior art. See MPEP 2114 and 2115. Further, the examiner notes that process limitations do not have patentable weight in an apparatus claim. See *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969) that states (Expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof and to an intended operation are no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim."

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom P. Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2794. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM (IFP).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tom Duong  
January 24, 2008

TD



Glenn Caldarola  
Supervisor, Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700